G. P. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1906
(Miscl)

File No. 38

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month _____

SUBJECT.

Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswamy Hanumanta Devaru and Narasimhaswamy temples at Heggere, Tumkur Taluk

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

M f 100-13-142

G.R.S.11] 1908-09

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Mysore)

NOTES.

File No. 38-06 ~~43-08~~

FILE HEADING.

Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswamy, Hanumanta Devaru and Narasimha Devaru temples at Heggere, Tumkur Taluk

From

The Dy Commr, Tumkur Dist

No. 185 Dated 22-10-08 Received 4-11-08

Diary No. 57	Enclos. 1 file Spare Copies –	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Reports on the Appeal from Shankaraga Dasa Narasiah against the Dy Commr's ord regarding the Archakship of Sri R Swamy and other temples at Heggere

NOTES AND ORDERS.

SW. 18) In the extract of the Inam Regr received from the Inam Superintendent, the of Ramakrishniah is mentioned as the f during the Inam Settlement of 1864- from the Vernacular records

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—30,000—3-4-07

Serial No.

from the Dy Commissioner, it is observed as follows:—

The contending parties to the suit are Shanbhogue Lakshminarasiah who is the Appellant before Court and his brother Ranganna. After the death of Nakdar Sujanies Ramakrishnaiah and another Sitharya who were Satani. by Caste in the year Dhata (1876), their family became extinct, the Puje was stopped and the Dyadi due on the Inam lands fell into arrears. In the year 1880, the Amildar having submitted a Remission Statement, the late Dewan Sir K. Seshadri Iyer who was the then Dy Commissioner entered thereon as under:—

Vide authenticated copy produced by the Appellant) Exhibit Y)

"Remitted this should be entered in the Shanbhogue's name"

It is reported that from that date, the Puje Nak devolved on the petitioner's family.

On the 30th January 1906, Ranganna addressed an unstamped miscellaneous petition to the Taluk office stating that he was performing Puje in the temple for 10 or 15 years,

Exhibit X)

GPB—50,000—13-5 08

Serial No.

and that he had latterly given it up owing to some inconvenience and praying that he might be permitted to enjoy worship as before and placed in possession of the Inam lands on condition of his paying Rs 15/- for repairs etc. to the temple.

On the recommendation of the Amildar in his report dated 30th October 1906, the Dy. Commissioner sanctioned the appointment of the petr Ranganna as Archak in place of Lakshminarasiah (Vide order Dy 9th November 1906)

Lakshminarasiah having appealed to Govt against the above order, the Appeal was referred for report to the Dy Commissioner.

During the enquiry that was instituted by the Local authorities, Lakshminarasiah deposes on the 30th January last, that he and his brother Ranganna are members of a divided family, that the Archakship in question is his self-acquired property, being conferred on him in the year 1880, that he executed repairs to the temple

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5 08

Serial No.

at a large out-lay. That he her asked his brother to conduct worship for some time, but removed him as he failed to do so, and that he has since then made arrangements for the regular conduct of services. He hopes that he may not be dispossessed of the post held by him

The only document produced by him is the authenticated copy of the Remission Statement referred to above.

(As regards the original Taluka, the Record-keeper of the Taluka-office states that there was kept in that office to show that the original was destroyed on 16th January 05, but when asked to explain as to how a copy of it came to be granted under dated 31st January 1907, he states that the then Record-keeper is of unsound mind (Epileptic), consequently he could not get at the truth and suggests that the particular paper might have escaped destruction somehow, but might have been subsequently destroyed)

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5 08

Serial No.

(Sub 7) Ramgauna states that the Archak and Shankhogi Posts are hereditary in his family, that at the time of partition, his father orally directed that his brother should attend To Shankhogi Post, while he, Archak duties, that he was doing Puja work for some time and was paying the poor on the Inam lands for three years; that as the emoluments attached To the post were insufficient To maintain his family, he had To leave the place to about requesting his brother (appellant) To worship for him; that he has the receipt of only one year in evidence of the poor paid and that other receipts were lost and that his brother repaired the temple out of the contributions levied from the devotees.

(Sub 8) He has produced 2 documents, one of which is a petition of the 24th November 1890 with the written orders of the Amildar on the overleaf and the other is also a petition with the Survey Superintendent's original orders thereon In both of them

GPB—50,000—13-5 08

Serial No.

Rangamma calls himself as the Archaka of the temple. These petitions relate To the ~~dessensions~~ division of certain temple Khalsa lands into a separate Number and the registry of the Khata thereof in the name of Rangamma.

The Dy Commissioner now reports that as both parties have not produced any satisfactory evidence, it is difficult To decide To whom belongs the puja right and states that he approves of the Amildar's recommendation as one and the same man cannot perform the duties of both Shanbhogue and Archak satisfactorily.

The Appellant complains that the Dy Commr's order is summary being based on the Amildar's report and that he was neither examined by the Dy. Commissioner nor were the documents in his possession examined. The 3 temples in question Submitted for orders are mutt institutions being endowed with

AG 23/11/08

GPB—50,000—15-5 08

Serial No.

+ (Stp P)

Inam lands as particularized in the Dy. Comm's. report of the 26th October 1908.

The question relates to the performance of the duties of a hereditary appointment viz the Archakship and as such it has been decided on regular suits before the Amildar in the first instance, before the D/Comm! on appeal and by Govt on second appeal. In the present case however orders have been passed on Miscellaneous petns. May the case be remanded to the D/Comm!, the parties filing a regular suit before the Amildar?

Submitted for orders
Sd 25/11/08

Note by the under Secretary -

This is a simple case The Ranganathaswamy temple at Heggare in the Tumkur Taluk is a Muzrai Institution with 21 acres and 21 guntas of inam land assessed at Rs 36—4—0

GPB—50,000—15-5 08

Serial No.

The Jodi and cesses payable to Govt amount Rs 9 5 6 annually.

The temple had Satani pujaris who died in the famine of Dhata Subsequently no puja was performed in some years and the Jodi fell into arrears. In the year 1880 a remission list was placed before the then Deputy Commissioner with a recommendation in these terms:— "The Pujari is dead without any heirs. The lands were banjar in Bahudhanya & Pramadi the dues were recovered by selling the produce of the lands. As it is necessary to appoint a pujari and get puja done in future the inam tenure may be continued and the arrears remitted.

The Deputy Commissioner sanctioned the remission adding the following remark:— ಸಂ ಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಇಡಿರಿ.

[The original remission list with the Deputy Commissioner's order is lost and has not been satisfactorily

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13.5 08

Serial No.

accounted for - The Taluk record show that it was burnt in 1905, but a copy has been granted in 1907 by the then record Keeper who is said to be mad now The present record Keeper says that perhaps this particular paper was, by oversight, not burnt in 1905 but was burnt after the copy was granted. This explanation is not satisfactory and it may be doubted if really an order was passed in 1880 in the terms mentioned]. It is upon this order that the claims of the contending parties, who are uterine brothers, are based.

The appellant who is the elder brother says that the Shanbhogue referred to in the order is himself, that he performed puja for some years and then appointed his younger brother, the respondent, for some time, that he did not satisfactorily discharged the duties, that the appellant then

GPB—50,000—13-5 08

Serial No.

appointed
a Satani Chennakesaviah who
continued about ten years or so
and that subsequently appellant's
son has been performing the puja.

The respondent while admitting
most of these facts says that
at a division the Shanbhogi
went to his brother and the
Pujarikak to himself, that he
discharged the duties for some
time and then left the village
on account of poverty and
that when on his return he
asked for the office in 1906 his
brother would not give it to him.
The respondent complained to the
Amildar in 1906 who recommended
that respondent Ranganna
might be appointed Pujari as he
had been Pujari for some time
and as the Shanbhogue could not
discharge both duties satisfactorily
This recommendation was sanction-
-ed by the Deputy Commissioner;
and against this order of the Deputy
Commissioner Shanbhogue Lakshmi
Narasiah has appealed.

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5 08

Serial No.

It seems to me that neither of the parties is entitled to the office. The Deputy Commissioner's order of 1880 cannot be interpretted as making over the office and the lands to the Shanbhogue. As the recommendation was that the inam tenure should continue as it was proposed to appoint a Pujari the Deputy Commissioner was of opinion that the Shanbhogue should be responsible for the appointment of a Pujari and for the Kaindayam till such appointment. It could not be that he intended that the Shanbhogue should enjoy the lands and perform the Puja I therefore recommend that the management of the lands should be assumed by Government and that a Sri Vaishnava or, if this is not possible, a Satani may be appointed Pujari. Seeing that the brothers quarrel about the land and produce I am

GPB—50,000—13.5.08

Serial No.

inclind to think that a fair income is yielded.

In consideration of the fact that the appellant had arranged for the Puja till 1906 and used his influence to collect contributions for the temple repairs he may be appointed sole Dharmadarsi.

Two other temples have similarly been dealt with in 1880; and perhaps the Shanbhogue was Pujari for all If so, they, with their endowments, may also be taken under Government management.

Submitted to the Second Councillor } Abdul Majid

Camp Harihar } 4th February 1909

The Rice of archak has been in the enjoyment of the Shanbog family since 1880 - i.e for 28 years. In whatever way

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18 5 08

Serial No.

they might have obtained the archakship & the lands we have to respect the fact of long possession. The case would be different if there were any claimants to the Office now.

Please therefore decide as between the brothers. The Dy Commrs decision appears on the face of it to be equitable, but I have an open mind in the matter.

4.08
8.2.09

As between the brothers the younger one may be confirmed as he has the Manigarar Mutt attached. Should order be passed it is incumbent

Submitted to Hon'ble Commissioner

Dinshaw
9/2/09

I agree. Dy Commissioner may be confirmed

9/2/09

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18 5 08

9/2/09

9.3.09

venue
riat. File No. of 190

Serial No. 10408

Draft submitted to Executive Council Australasia

9/3/09

12/3/09

Approved
[illegible]
13/3/09

[illegible]

10/3/09

GPB—50 000—13-5-08

Muz. 4]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. M/50, dt. 21/3/07

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 3914

dated 21 : 2 : 07 received at this

Office from Shanbhogue Lakshmi-
narasiah of Heggere,
Tumkur Taluk, re the
Archakship of the
Sri Ranganathaswamy
temple at the place,

is forwarded, together with its

enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of

the Tumkur District

for submission of the entire records connected with the case together with a detailed report thereon.

By Order,

(Sd) illegible 1/4/07

Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

BANGALORE,
1 / 4 / 19 .

ಅಂಚೆ ಶಾಖೆ
ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ
ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ 31/3/07

16/11

Muz. 1]

190

From

To

The Superintendent of
Inam Settlements in mysore

Dated

Despatched 1/11/1

Received

General No. 2/1/1

No.

Enclosure No.

Has the honor to request that an extract of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Inam lands for the up-keep of the Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at Heggere in the Tumkur Taluk may be kindly forwarded to this office for reference

By 17/11/08

GPL—3,000- 19-9-07

Ad 1571/1

Inam Superintendent's Office,
Bangalore dy 26th/27th November 1907

No 56
1

From

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Muzrai Department

Sir,

As requested in your docket No 2363
dated 19th November 1907, I have the honor to
forward herewith a copy of the Inam Register
pertaining to the grant of Inam lands to Ranga-
-nathaswamy's temple at Kiggere village, in
the Tumkur Taluk.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

Register Sheet No 67.

Village :— Heggare' ,— .

Hobby : — Tunkur : — .

Salute : — Tunkur : — .

Copy of the

Register of Inams in the village of Heggare.—

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
		Jamin Jada account 1805-6.		
3	Devadaya.	Dry	" — 18 — $15\frac{3}{4}$	12.55
		Wet	1 — 14 — "	4.05
			2 — 12 — $15\frac{3}{4}$	16.60
	Title Deed No 99.			

t of Tumkur, — in the Taluk of Tumkur, —

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
4 – 5 – 10 4 – 5 – 10 8 – 11 – 8		For the support of the temple which is said to be in good order and pooja performed.	5 – 13 – 2

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11
"	"

Tumkur: —.

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poornaiah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
"	Jamin Jada account 1805-6. ~~Dry " — 3 — 7~~ ~~Wet " — 6 — 5 1/2~~ Dry " — 18 — 15 3/4 Wet — 1 — 14 — " Rungaswamy.	Jamabandy Clitta. 1860 Dry " — 18 — 15 3/4 Wet — 1 — 14 — " Rungeswamy Jari Sittala account. 1803—4. Dry " — 9 — 4 Wet " — 9 — 8 Do: —.

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Hegare Rangaramma Divara. Poojari Ramakrishnaiah and Narasa devaru enjoy the land.	"	"	"

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Assistant's opinion and recommendation.	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20
To be confirmed on the existing jodi viz Rs 5-13-" 1/12/69. "Signed" C. SoobRow. Assistant.	To be confirmed Jo-di of Rs 5-13-". 4.3.70. "Initld" B. Gopaliah. Special Assistant Confirmed subject to a jodi of Rs 5-13-" 29th April 70. "Signed" C. S. Blair Offg: Inam Commr"
Inam Superintendent's Office Dated, Bangalore, 26th/27th Nov" 1907 Copy.	"Copy" D Rama Rao Superintendent of Inam Settlement.

GPB—1,000 books of 2 sheets each—9-8-06.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
1920
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

A.V.

Please put up
a note for orders
by 9/11/07

A.V.

1907-08

From The Deputy Commr
Tumkur District

To The Secy to the Govt
of H.H. the Maha Raja
of Mysore Dewan Dept

Dated 26th
Despatched 30th
Received
} October 1907

General No.
No. 241
Enclosure No. 2 cuddapah
telegram.

This official memo No
4753 dated the 4th
April 1907

Forty a report on
the petition of Chun-
-chaji Venkatrama Para
-dhan of Heggere in
the Tumkur District
re the alleged unfit-
-ness of the Sri Rangan-
-atha Swamy temple
at Heggere

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

Dated, Tumkur 26th October 1907

From K. Deva Swami Iyer Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To
K. Anantaswami Rao Esq. B.A.
Secretary to the Government of H.H.
the Maha Rajah of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.
Bangalore

Sir,

With reference to your official Memo No. 4753 dated the 4th April 1907 and docket No. 885 dated the 14th August 1907, calling for a report on the petition of Shamboh Sri Krishna Varadachar of Heggere, Tumkur Taluk, regarding the Archakship of the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple at the place, I have the honor to state that the temple of the Sri Ranganatha Swami as well as those of the Sri Varasimha Swami and the Sri Anjaneya Swami are Muzrai institutions endowed with the original

noted Quamlando. There is no
Kalidas Pujaric for these temples
A.xon of the Petitioner was
attending to the worship of
these deities. The Munidar of
the Tumkur Zilla Court reported
that the Petitioner is the village
Chimboque and that, by his
influence he would be managed
to come by the Archakaship
in question, as well as the Inam
lands attached thereto. The
Petitioner produced no written
authority appointing him to
the Archakaship in question

One Venkanna of Nagare,
who is reported to have wor-
shipped the deities for some
years before but who left the
worship subsequently owing
to some domestic inconvenience,
of his, came forward &
to take it up and offered to pay
Rs. 5 annually towards the
cost of executing an Inam to the

				9 – 5 = 6	
				" – 8 – 6	
				6 – 10 – 6	

temples should ibe be appointed
as Archak thurig. The Amil
dar recommended his ex
appointment and it was accord-
-ingly approved by me. The
appeal in question, is against
this order.

The vernacular records
bearing on the subject are ex
herewith submitted, together
with the enclosures to the
Communications under ex
reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
M. Srinivasachari
Asst Deputy Commissioner
MC

Draft for approval

Muz. 1]

190

From Muz F 35-06

To

The Dy Commr

Tumkur District

Dated

Despatched 6/12/06

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Vide Asst Supdt's letter no. 56/224, Dy 26-11-1906.

Adverting to his letter no 241 dated 26th October 1904, reporting on the Archakship of the Sri Ranganathaswamy and two other temples at Heggere in the Tumkur Taluk, has the honor to observe from the enclosed petitions addressed to this office, that the appellant Lakshminarasiah states that in the year 1880, under orders of the late Dewan Sir K Sheshad Iyer, the then [illegible] C

he was appointed as the Archak of the said temples ~~Documents if any in support of this fact~~ Enquiries if the allegation is true & if so the records relating thereto should be submitted

2) The appellant states in his deposition dated 10th August 1906 before the Hobli Shekdar, that Ranganna who has been recommended to the Archakship in question, was doing the Archak duties as Gumastha on his behalf, for 3 or 4 years, and that Ranganna did not attend to his duties satisfactorily, ~~on this point~~ It should be reported if ~~should be reported upon~~ this statement is true.

3) The Dy. Commr is also requested to report what claims the said Ranganna has to the post in question and whether he has been appointed as Archak by any competent authority, and if so, the order if any, ~~there~~ appointing him as such should also be submitted

4) The remainder needs are necessitated

Dy Commr 5/12/09

16. 12. 07

Muz. 1 A] Muz F 38-06

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq, B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Dy - Commr
Tumkur Distt.

Dated

Despatched 18. 12. 07

Received

General No. 2369
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No One.

Referring to this office docket no 2636 dated 6th December 1904 calling for further particulars regarding the Archakship of Sri Rangaswamy and two others temple at Heggere in the Tumkur has the honor to forward herewith petition registered no 2384

GBP—3 000 copies 21-9-07

ated 6th December 1904 from
anbhogue Lakshminarasiah
saying that the pradhan
the temple lands should
be made over to the
inter. petitioner Rangama,
that it may be held
deposit pending the disposal
his appeal by Govt.
"I the Dy Commr
"is requested to ~~issue such~~ expedite the subm of the
~~orders as he may deem~~
~~fit~~ in the ~~matter~~ and report
~~the facts~~ to Govt together
with the information already
called for ~~herewith~~.

By order,

Dfd 15/12/09

Secretary.

Copy
Mot. to the petr. by messenger

D 56.

190 File no 93/08

From Dept E 38-06.
The Deputy Commissioner
Jaffna Distt

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Dated 22nd October 1908

Despatched

Received

General No. 185
No.

Enclosure No. one file

Furnishing particulars of archaeolith of Sri Ramanathaswami Temple and 2 others at Thaiyiddy Jaffna Taluk

Mr
Mr Lewis
Please submit Note
Q
30/10/08
Ag
for Ret on
31/10/08
Rec'd with ret
4/11/08

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District
Dated the 22nd October 1908

From

K. Doraswami Iyer Esq
Deputy-Commissioner
Tumkur District

To

K. S. Chandrasekhara Iyer Esq BA BL
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
General & Revenue Departments
(Mwz rai)

Sir,

With reference to your docket no 2686, dated 6 December 1907, and Official memorandum no 5884, dated 11th May 1908, calling for further particulars regarding the archakaship of Sri Ranganathaswamy and two other temples at Heggere in the Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to report as follows:-

2. The appellant Lakshmi Narasaiya and the Respondent Ranganna are uterine brothers. Previous to the year Dhatu (1876), two Satanis Rama bhadraiya and Sibaiya were performing the puja of the deities - These Satanis died during the year Dhatu and their family became extinct. Since then, the puja

stopped and the Jodi due on the temple Inam lands fell into arrears. In the year 1880, the Amildar having submitted a remission statement, the then Deputy Commissioner ordered on the statement as follows — "Remitted. This should be entered in the Shanbogue's name" and from that date, it is reported that the puja hak devolved on the Shanbogue's family. These facts are admitted by both parties -

3. It will thus be seen that Lakshmi Narasaiya's family does not possess any hereditary right to the puja. Lakshmi Narasaiya states that he has no written authority to show that he was appointed to perform the puja except the remarks of the then Deputy Commissioner stated above, that he had permitted Rangamma to perform the puja for some time and that as he did not perform the puja properly he (Lakshmi Narasaiya) took it back from him

Rangamma deposes that he also has no written authority for his appointment as archak but alleges that by some family arrangement made by his father, he was doing the puja, and that he handed over charge of the Hak to Lakshmi Narasaiya

as he had to go elsewhere to seek his livelihood -

Patel Bhadregowda and other villagers endorse the statement given by Lakshmi Narasaya.

4. Since both parties have not produced any satisfactory documentary evidence it is now difficult to decide to whom belongs the puja rights - It is admitted by both that Rangama did the puja for some years. As to whether Rangama did the puja with his brother's permission or independently claiming title from his father is not borne out by the records.

5. As the Amildar reported that one and the same man cannot perform the duties of both Shanbogue and Archak satisfactorily and that Rangama who was once worshipping the Deities maybe appointed to the Archakship, the recommendation was approved of by me.

6 The Vernacular file of correspondence on the subject is herewith submitted.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

[illegible]
Deputy Commissioner

2055
cpd 9.3.09 Revised Dft as per order,

.S. 28]

38-06
File No ~~43-08~~

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 56

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

, *the* 190

Date of issue 20.3.1909

Signed by H.V.R. [illegible]

READ—

Petition registered no 3914 dated 21st February 1904 from Shanbhogue Lakshminarasiah of Heggane in the Tumkur Taluk appealing against the Dy. Comm's order regarding the Archakship of the Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at the place

Correspondence ending with letter no 185 dated 22nd October 1908 from the Dy. Commr, Tumkur District, reporting on the above

Letter no 56 dated 26th November 1904 from the Superintendent

~~ORDER THEREON. No.~~

SUBJECT

GPD—6,000 13-08

of Inam Settlements in Mysore
forwarding a copy of the Inam
register pertaining to the grant
of Inam lands to the temple

Order thereon no 1326 D/20-3-09

The temple of Sri Ranganatha Eccl/file
Swamy at Heggare in the
Tumkur Taluk is a muzrai
institution endowed with Inam
lands measuring 2a 21g and 2f
and assessed at Rs 36-4-0,
with cesses amounting
to Rs 9-5-6 per annum

2) From the Vernacular
records received under cover of
the Dy Comm's Communication
read above and the extract of
the Inam register received
from the Inam Superintendent,
it is observed that the temple
had originally Satani Inferior
who died in the famine of Dhata
and consequently the worship
in the temple ceased for some
years and the cess due on the

Inam lands fell into arrear. In the year 1880, a remission list was placed before the then Dy Commr with a recommendation in these terms.- 'The Pujari is dead without any heirs. The lands were Banjar in Bahudhanya In Pramade the dues were recovered by selling the produce of the lands. As it is necessary to appoint a Pujari and get Puje done in future, the Inam tenure may be continued and the arrears remitted'. The Dy Commr Sanctioned the remission adding the following remark:—
'ಶಂ ಸ ಪೂಜೆ ನ ಕ ಲ ಮಾ ಅ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದೆ ನಾ'.

3) Thereupon the Appellant performed Puje for some years and then asked his younger brother, the Respt Rangana To perform Puje Rangana did so for some ~~years~~ time and then left the village Appellt appointed one Satanu channa-kesviah as Pujari and latterly appellant's son was performing Puje.

4)

4) The Respt: ~~came back~~ returned to the village in 1906 and requested that the office may be given back to him. The Aplt: being unwilling to give back the office the Respt: complained to the Builder who recommended that Respt: Ranganna might be appointed as Archak as he had been Pujari for some time and as the Shanbhogue could not discharge both duties satisfactorily. This recommendation was sanctioned by the Dy. Commr. Against the foregoing order, Shanbhogue Lakshminarasiah has appealed to Court.

5) Appellant says that he is the Shanbhogue Respt. to in the Dy. Commr's order of 1880 and that therefore the office is his self-acquisition and he should get it.

6) The Respt: says that at a partition the Shanbhogi went to his brothers and the ~~Pujarike~~ fell to his share, that he discharges the duties for some time.

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

and left the village on account of poverty and that he should get back the office

4) The Dy. Comm's opinion that the appellant cannot satisfactorily discharge the duties both of Shanbhogs and Arehak is accepted by Govt. His decision that, while the Appellant is Shanbhog the Respt who was once performing both, should be the Arehak is equitable the order is confirmed and the appeal rejected.

Govt. order 8 12/3/1915

for Secretary

To,

The Dy. Comm, Dharwar

Dist

Retng. the record

Sent to the Appellant

13/3/09

8/2013.09

F 73-08

మై నెం 80 నగర్ కాలనీ ఎదురుగా ఉన్న ఖాళీ స్థలాన్ని

ఆ ఓ ఆవరణ కొరకు కేటాయించండి

కోరడం ఈ కాలనీ వాసులు మొక్కలు నాటి వాటిని సంరక్షించుకోవడానికి

ఇట్లు

ఈ కాలనీ వాసులు ఎందరో ఎన్నో సార్లు ఈ ఖాళీ స్థలం ఆవరణ కొరకు

ఈ కాలనీ వాసులు